



U.S. Department  
of Transportation  
**Pipeline and Hazardous  
Materials Safety  
Administration**

1200 New Jersey Avenue SE  
Washington DC 20590

## PIPELINE SAFETY

### 2010 State Damage Prevention Grant

for

Utility Notification Center of Colorado

Please follow the directions listed below:

1. Review the entire document for completeness.
2. Review and have an authorized signatory sign page 2.
3. Fasten all pages with a paper or binder clip - no staples please as this package will be scanned upon it's arrival at PHMSA.
4. Mail the entire document, including this cover page to the following:

**ATTN: Karina Munoz  
U.S. Department of Transportation  
Pipeline & Hazardous Materials Safety Administration  
Office of Contracts and Procurement  
1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE Second Floor E22-228  
Washington, D.C. 20590**

#### **FedSTAR Information**

Submission Date: 8/31/2009 1:52:32 PM



**Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration  
1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE  
Washington DC 20590**

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

### APPLICATION

#### 2010 GRANT PROGRAM IN SUPPORT OF STATE DAMAGE PREVENTION

The Utility Notification Center of Colorado hereby applies to the Department of Transportation for Federal funds appropriated for the support of State Damage Prevention Programs established under 49 U.S.C. Section 60134 et seq.

The State agency plans to carry out the State Damage Prevention Program, during calendar year 2010, as described in Attachment 1, "Project Abstract/Statement of Objectives". To accomplish the program, the state agency proposes to expend funds as set forth in Attachment 4, "State Damage Prevention Estimated Budget".

---

Signature

---

Title

---

Date



#### Statement of Progress

Colorado made significant progress in 2008 and 2009 with the assistance of the PHMSA Grant funding. We have provided an attachment that illustrates a number of demographic, One-Call, and damage measures and metrics (UNCC 2010 PHMSA 03-09 Damage Prev Metrics.pdf). The measures show that along with a slowing economy, the construction activity, incoming tickets and facility damages have all decreased significantly from 2006-2008. These measures alone do not demonstrate that public awareness and damage prevention efforts have caused the reduction in facility damages. But the damage prevention metric (damages / 1,000 incoming tickets) in the lower portion of the table shows a steady decrease that started back in 2004. Colorado has decreased its all-facility damages per 1,000 tickets from 17.2 in 2003 to 8.7 in 2008, a 49% decrease. In addition, Colorado has decreased its Natural Gas facility damages per 1,000 tickets from 5.7 in 2003 to 2.7 in 2008, a 53% decrease.

Colorado's legislatively mandated requirement to report damages as well as our efforts to understand root causes and disseminate this information, via the annual Damage Report, to stakeholders groups such as the DPCs has had a positive impact. The introduction of the County Damage Prevention Report Cards and the formation of the Damage Prevention Action Team (DPAT) in 2008, along with PHMSA Grant finding in 2008 and 2009 helped accelerate the reduction in damages. Stakeholders in Colorado have embraced our programs to collaborate on public awareness and damage prevention efforts and to utilize accurate damage data to identify and target areas and stakeholder groups that need to improve their damage prevention efforts.

We wish to sincerely thank PHMSA for its support and financial assistance and hope PHMSA will see the value in our programs and continue to support us as we move forward.

#### List of Attachments (PDF)

##### UNCC 2010 PHMSA Expense Summary.pdf

Summarizes grant expenses by Expense Category and Element

##### UNCC 2010 PHMSA Facilitator Labor Detail.pdf

Summarizes Forum Facilitator labor hours by task and month for Elements 2, 7, and 9

##### UNCC 2010 PHMSA Facilitator Travel Exp Detail.pdf

Summarizes Forum Facilitator travel expenses by task, month and expense type for Elements 2 and 9

##### UNCC 2010 PHMSA SW Dev Labor Detail.pdf

Summarizes Software Developers labor hours by task and month for Elements 7 and 9

##### UNCC 2010 PHMSA 03-09 Damage Prev Metrics.pdf

Summarizes One-Call, damage and demographic measures and metrics for 2003, 2006-2008

##### UNCC 2010 PHMSA 2009 Share of Pop Tick Dam.pdf

Summarizes share of population, One-Call tickets, and damages for 11 Damage Prevention Councils for Element-2

##### UNCC 2010 PHMSA 2009 Damage Prev Activities.pdf

Summarizes 2009 damage prevention activities in counties with DPC support for Element-9

## State Damage Prevention Elements

### **ELEMENT 1 - EFFECTIVE COMMUNICATIONS**

"Participation by operators, excavators, and other stakeholders in the development and implementation of methods for establishing and maintaining effective communications between stakeholders from receipt of an excavation notification until successful completion of the excavation, as appropriate."

**Does the proposed project address this element? (Required)** No

**Describe any existing state initiatives that support this element: (Required)**

#### Existing State Initiatives

UNCC is considered a leading One-Call center and innovator of damage prevention programs. Colorado's One-Call process aligns with CGA's One-Call Best Practices and undergoes continual improvement. The One-Call process is the foundation for damage prevention programs within Colorado and provides the hub of participation by all stakeholders and effective communication between stakeholders.

#### Overview of Colorado One-Call Participation and Communication:

- ? UNCC has over 1,300 owner and operator members. Colorado One-Call Law requires all facility owners/operators to register as members with the call center.
- ? UNCC Board of Directors is elected and represents all facility types and sizes and includes a voting representative of the excavator community.
- ? UNCC has a 7x24 hour operation that provides for 2nd notices, scheduled pre-mark meets, emergency notification, damage notification, damage reporting, positive response, and ticket management.
- ? UNCC has an Alternative Dispute Resolution program defined under the law.
- ? UNCC budgets \$50,000 for public 811 awareness promotion and stakeholder education.
- ? UNCC has a full time Public Relations Administrator who:
  - Develops and manages 811 Public Awareness promotion and media campaigns
  - Attends public and industry trades shows
  - Attends and disseminates relevant information to local Damage Prevention Councils (DPC)
  - Attends and helps coordinate efforts of the statewide Damage Prevention Action Team (DPAT)
  - Conducts stakeholder damage prevention education, excavation safety meetings, and tailgate talks
  - Serves as a knowledgeable resource on the Colorado One-Call Law
- ? UNCC technology processes and systems include:
  - Norfield One-Call Ticketing System (same as Virginia Pilot Program vendor)
  - Web Ticket Entry for both professionals and homeowners
  - Electronic delivery of notifications and 2nd notifications to members
  - Polygon mapping for improved facility definition
  - Use of aerial photographs and ownership plats to identify excavation area
  - Internal GPS collection of street centerline data for incomplete public datasets

- Electronic Appointment Scheduling for excavators, owners and locators (legislative requirement 9-1.5-103.4a)
  - Positive Response System for facility owners to notify excavators (legislative requirement 9-1.5-103.4a)
  - Ticket Management System for facility owners
- ? Awareness of One-Call legislation was documented by an independent survey in 2007 to be about 91% statewide.

Beyond a robust One-Call process and ticket management system, Colorado stakeholders utilize the following processes and systems to further enhance participation and communication:

- ? UNCC developed the nation's first "all-facility" damage reporting system, which was purchased by CGA, and currently uses the CGA Virtual Private DIRT (VP-DIRT).
- ? Damages are submitted by facility owners to VP-DIRT within 90 days (legislative requirement 9-1.5-103.7b).
- ? UNCC publishes an annual facility Damage Report for review by stakeholders including the Colorado PUC (legislative requirements 9-1.5-103.7c and 9-1.5-105.2.6b).
- ? Damages are also called-in and recorded in the ticketing system by excavators as they occur (legislative requirement 9-1.5-103.5).
- ? UNCC has defined and implemented an Alternative Dispute Resolution Program (legislative requirement 9-1.5-104.3).
- ? Colorado has two CGA Regional Partnerships (Denver Metro DPC and El Paso County DPC).
- ? Colorado has 11 active Damage Prevention Councils (DPCs) that provides an effective platform for stakeholders to meet, to discuss, and to resolve issues affecting damage prevention in local areas.
- ? Colorado has 2 Joint Utility Coordinating Committees (JUCCs) that meet monthly to coordinate construction and excavation activities on current projects.
- ? With the aid of 2008 PHMSA Grant funding, Colorado established the Damage Prevention Action Team (DPAT) in the fall of 2008. It was well received and is now supported by all stakeholder groups. This group consists of a core group of dedicated damage prevention leaders from communities throughout Colorado. The DPAT fosters cooperation and coordination amongst stakeholders, with a special emphasis on damage prevention awareness and activities.
- ? Several major highway improvement projects have also effectively utilized damage prevention coordinating practices during pre-bid, design, and construction phases.
- ? Individual facility owners have developed very effective public 811 awareness and media campaigns as well as stakeholder training programs that include top offender tracking and education/rehabilitation programs, safety meeting presentations, tailgate talks, and general public awareness campaigns. Two that stand out include Xcel Energy (statewide) and Colorado Springs Utilities (El Paso County).
- ? In response to RP1162, pipeline operators around the state have implemented many effective public 811 awareness campaigns and stakeholder educational programs including

radio and TV spots, direct mailings, excavator awareness and education events, and first responder events.

Finally, the annual Damage Report along with the new County Damage Prevention Report Cards created in 2008 (with the assistance of 2008 PHMSA Grant funds) provides the necessary feedback mechanism to allow stakeholders to analyze and respond to local conditions and challenges, to design targeted awareness and educational programs, and to compare their damage prevention activities and performance against other areas within the state.

The goal of all these programs is to improve cooperation and coordination between stakeholders, to reduce the occurrence of underground facility damage, and to help protect the lives and property of the public.



**ELEMENT 2 - COMPREHENSIVE STAKEHOLDER SUPPORT**

"A process for fostering and ensuring the support and partnership of stakeholders, including excavators, operators, locators, designers, and local government in all phases of the program."

**Does the proposed project address this element? (Required)** Yes

**Describe any existing state initiatives that support this element: (Required)**

Existing State Initiatives:

UNCC, facility owners/operators and other stakeholders have demonstrated their commitment to active participation in damage prevention awareness and education for many years. UNCC encourages active and collaborative participation in the DPCs, the JUCC, the DPAT, and most recently, in the EDPI Forum supported by PHMSA grant funds, as well as many other damage prevention activities and events around the state.

Colorado has had three DPCs in operation for many years. These include the Denver Metro (CGA Regional Partner), El Paso County (CGA Regional Partner), and Weld County DPCs. Each has sponsored effective public awareness and stakeholder education programs and provided an effective forum to discuss and resolve stakeholder concerns and issues.

Las Animas and Mesa Counties started DPCs in 2004 and have also developed effective stakeholder programs and provided leadership and unique damage prevention programs.

With the passage of the Pipeline Safety Improvement Act in Dec., 2002, RP1162 identified and recommended practices to improve public safety. Pipeline operators in Colorado banded together starting in 2004 to provide enhanced public awareness and stakeholder education. Four additional DPCs have been started since then in the 4-Corners area, the Western Slope area, the North West area, and the Mountain (PEG) area. These four DPCs have extended the reach of public awareness and stakeholder training in rural parts of the state to include first responders, emergency planners, government officials, and regulatory agencies in many communities.

Two additional DPCs were started in 2009 in Larimer and Fremont Counties, bringing the total to eleven DPCs that provide public awareness and stakeholder education. Also, two cities, Aurora and Pueblo, support Joint Utility Coordinating Committees.

These thirteen organizations sponsor and support damage prevention activities in 24 of the 64 counties in Colorado, covering 38% of the counties and representing about 86% of the population, 85% of the locate request activity and 86% of the facility damages in the state.

Additionally, with the support of the 2008 and 2009 PHMSA Grant funding, the statewide Damage Prevention Action Team (DPAT) was created in 2008 and now provides collaborative leadership and coordination of public 811 awareness activities throughout the state. This group consists of the dedicated damage prevention professionals from around the state. DPAT is tasked with identifying problem areas in the state based upon current damage data and developing and coordinating public 811 awareness and stakeholder education

programs. As they become better organized and funded, they will take over responsibility for requesting and allocating future PHMSA grant funds.

We are also pleased with the active participation of the Colorado Contractors Association, the Colorado PUC and the 3 major contract locating firms.

**Describe how the proposed project will enhance or continue implementation of this element: (Required only if proposal addresses this element)**

Improving Damage Prevention in Colorado:

Although Colorado has a number of active and effective damage prevention initiatives throughout the state, these efforts can be improved through more effective stakeholder collaboration and consensus, coordinated efforts and programs, and a unifying theme.

We are requesting continued support of the EDPI Forum that PHMSA funded in 2008 and 2009. The key role of the Forum Facilitator is to prepare and present useful damage prevention information to the DPAT and the DPCs for analysis, to encourage and lead the stakeholders to use the information to identify root causes of damage in their areas, and to empower and support collaboration between the stakeholders to take action to remediate the problems they identify in their areas.

1) The Forum Facilitator will continue to meet with the 11 DPCs and the DPAT during the year. At each meeting the Forum Facilitator will:

- a) review the 2008 and 2009 Damage Report
- b) review the 2008 and 2009 County Report Cards
- c) review the 2010 PHMSA Grant status
- d) discuss public 811 awareness and stakeholder education activities
- e) review and facilitate grant funding for local DP activities

2) The Forum Facilitator will make 27 trips to support this element:

- a) 7 monthly meeting each with Denver Metro and El Paso County DPCs
- b) 2 monthly meetings each with Weld County and Larimer County DPCs
- c) 1 monthly meeting with Fremont County DPC
- d) 1 monthly meeting with 6 remaining DPCs (6 overnight trips)
- e) 2 bi-annual meetings with DPAT (1 overnight trip)
- f) Create one to two additional DPCs in larger population areas



**ELEMENT 3 - OPERATOR INTERNAL PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT**

"A process for reviewing the adequacy of a pipeline operator's internal performance measures regarding persons performing locating services and quality assurance programs."

**Does the proposed project address this element? (Required)** No

**Describe any existing state initiatives that support this element: (Required)**

Existing State Initiatives:

Currently, facility owners may utilize in-house locators or contract with external locator services. Quite likely most, if not all, facility owners evaluate the performance of locators according to internal operating procedures. The Colorado PUC may also perform locator performance and quality assurance evaluation for some pipeline and gas operators. UNCC does not have any information on these procedures or the performance results.

The Colorado VP-DIRT damage data does include root cause of damage and some information regarding locator performance, although the data is not reported consistently by all stakeholders. Stakeholders are encouraged to review this information.



**ELEMENT 4 - EFFECTIVE EMPLOYEE TRAINING**

"Participation by operators, excavators, and other stakeholders in the development and implementation of effective employee training programs to ensure that operators, the one call center, the enforcing agency, and the excavators have partnered to design and implement training for the employees of operators, excavators, and locators."

**Does the proposed project address this element? (Required)** No

**Describe any existing state initiatives that support this element: (Required)**

Existing State Initiatives:

Currently, the development and delivery of damage prevention education and training programs in Colorado is performed by facility owners, excavating companies, locating companies, the DPCs, the One-Call center, industry associations and regulatory agencies. These organizations have not partnered to develop or adopt a single state-wide training curriculum for industry stakeholders.

Colorado State One-Call Law (Section 9-1.5-104.5 Penalties, 1c1 & 2c1) requires an "excavation safety training program with the notification association" for both facility owners/operators and excavators who fail to comply with the Law. Although UNCC attempted to provide this program in past years, it was not met with enthusiasm by the One-Call members. Also, there is no effective leverage under the Law to require non-compliance stakeholders to attend such a program. UNCC does provide stakeholder education programs on request through safety meetings, tailgate talks, and contractor events around the state.

Programs conducted by UNCC and several large facility owners have been very effective in specific areas of the state. Of special note are the programs developed and delivered by Xcel Energy (gas and electric distribution), Colorado Springs Utilities (municipal facilities) and many of the state's pipeline operators who have collaboratively developed and delivered damage prevention programs in response to RP1162.

Although all of the programs mentioned above were developed by various industry stakeholders, few have been developed through a collaborative stakeholder effort. In addition, programs that have demonstrated effectiveness have not been adopted by stakeholders at a statewide level.

**ELEMENT 6 - DISPUTE RESOLUTION**

"A process for resolving disputes that defines the State authority's role as a partner and facilitator to resolve issues."

**Does the proposed project address this element? (Required)** No

**Describe any existing state initiatives that support this element: (Required)**

Existing State Initiatives:

Colorado State One-Call Law (Section 9-1.5-104.3 ADR) provides for a broadly defined Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) program to be administered by UNCC. This definition includes voluntary "mediation, arbitration, or other appropriate processes of dispute resolution". UNCC has defined and implemented a robust ADR program.



**ELEMENT 7 - ENFORCEMENT**

"Enforcement of State damage prevention laws and regulations for all aspects of the damage prevention process, including public education, and the use of civil penalties for violations assessable by the appropriate State authority."

**Does the proposed project address this element? (Required)** Yes

**Describe any existing state initiatives that support this element: (Required)**

Existing State Initiatives:

Under the One-Call Law, UNCC, as the current State Authority, does not have authority to enforce the Law nor to assess civil penalties for stakeholders that are not in compliance with the Law. Non-compliance is defined under the Law (Section 9-1.5-104.5.1-2 Civil Penalties) as:

- 1) when a defined facility owner/operator is not a member of the One-Call center, and
- 2) when a defined excavator did not request a proper locate.

The Law further defines two stakeholders; a facility owner and an excavator; and the amount of the civil penalty that can be awarded. Two types of civil penalties are defined for the non-compliant stakeholders:

- 1) when a stakeholder is not in compliance and a damage did not occur (\$200), and
- 2) when a stakeholder is not in compliance and a damage did occur (\$5,000, \$25,000, \$75,000).

The Law further defines an aggrieved party (Section 9-1.5-104.5.3a-d Civil Penalties) and identifies that the authority to pursue a civil action lies with the aggrieved party in the District Court in the county where the damage occurred.

As part of the response for EDPI Initiative 7 in the 2008 and 2009 PHMSA Grant, the Denver Metro Damage Prevention Council (DMDPC) discussed and investigated the possibility of an assignment of the civil rights from the aggrieved party to the DMDPC. The UNCC lawyer determined that this assignment might have legal standing. In further discussions, two facility owners informed the DMDPC that they reserved the right to pursue civil penalties when damage did occur and would not assign their rights to the DMDPC.

In addition, Colorado Municipal Law restricts certain municipal entities and certain forms of public utility providers from pursuing civil action against customers and members of the community. A number of municipal facility owners indicated they would discuss the possibility of the assignment of civil rights.

Beyond the civil enforcement procedures defined in the Law and the stakeholder initiative discussed above, a number of facility owners conduct their own compliance and enforcement programs. These programs include identifying and contacting non-compliant stakeholders, investigating and determining fault, providing damage prevention safety education, and assessing civil penalties. These programs have been successful as measured by reduced damages for these specific facility owners. There is usually a carryover reduction in

### **ELEMENT 8 - TECHNOLOGY**

"A process for fostering and promoting the use, by all appropriate stakeholders, of improving technologies that may enhance communications, underground pipeline locating capability, and gathering and analyzing information about the accuracy and effectiveness of locating programs."

**Does the proposed project address this element? (Required)** Yes

**Describe any existing state initiatives that support this element: (Required)**

Existing State Initiatives:

Colorado has clearly demonstrated its commitment to investigating and utilizing appropriate technology to improve its damage prevention program. Although we do not have a program in place to investigate more accurate locating technologies, we are actively pursuing projects aimed at improving stakeholder communication and facility damage reporting.

PHMSA funded the development of the Damage Prevention Portal in 2008 and 2009. The software developers created a web portal infrastructure that allows groups of stakeholders to form communities to share information and coordinate activities. The portal currently provides access to One-Call incoming ticket data and facility damage data at the county level. When complete, the portal will provide access for all stakeholders to critical county level information that will make a positive impact on damage prevention practices and help reduce the number and severity of facility damages.

Information takes the leading role in helping stakeholders to:

- a) understand the state and scope of damage prevention in their local community
- b) understand the root causes of facility damages in their local community  
(this could include notification practices, location practices, and excavation practices)
- c) identify which stakeholder groups are contributing to the damage prevention problem  
(this could include facility type, excavator type, work type and equipment type)
- d) identify the relevant message that should be delivered to specific stakeholder groups
- e) identify viable communications venues to deliver the targeted message
- f) monitor and track progress of activities design to improve awareness and prevent damages
- g) monitor and track progress of remedial actions based upon feedback of critical metrics

**Describe how the proposed project will enhance or continue implementation of this element: (Required only if proposal addresses this element)**

Improving Damage Prevention in Colorado:

Additional modules must now be developed to include:

- 1) Compliance reporting and tracking (see Element-7)
- 2) Damage Prevention Activities scheduling and tracking (see Element-9)
- 3) County Damage Prevention Report Card preparation, reporting and tracking (see Element-9)

Since the basic infrastructure has been created, we have chosen to align the additional DP Portal development activities under the EDPI Elements that they most closely support.

**ELEMENT 9 - DAMAGE PREVENTION PROGRAM REVIEW**

"A process for review and analysis of the effectiveness of each program element, including a means for implementing improvements identified by such program reviews."

**Does the proposed project address this element? (Required)** Yes

**Describe any existing state initiatives that support this element: (Required)**

Existing State Initiatives:

Colorado's results in reducing the total number of facility damages as well as the number of damages per incoming ticket since 2003 demonstrate four critical elements of our damage prevention program:

- 1) our understanding of the nature of our damage prevention issues
- 2) our willingness to take action in light of comprehensive and unambiguous information
- 3) our ability to remediate the root causes of facility damage
- 4) our ability to track and measure the progress and success of initiatives and programs

A major component of our damage prevention program that has facilitated our success has been the collection and analysis of facility damage data and the dissemination of this valuable information to the stakeholders via the annual Damage Report introduced in 2001 (for 2000 data). But by its nature, damage prevention requires a local solution and the Damage Report only looked at statewide data. In 2006, we introduced the County Damage Data Sheets that assessed important damage data elements over time for each county. This information was useful for tracking results, but it did not provide clues as to why positive changes were occurring in some counties but not others.

In 2008, we introduced the Damage Prevention Report Cards (for 2007 damage data). The report cards utilized metrics to assess a) the public awareness level, b) the damage prevention level, and 3) the damage reporting efforts for all facility types consolidated together in each county. Each county was then assigned a letter grade for each of these metrics as well as an overall grade. But the conditions and likelihood of damage for each facility type are different. So in 2009 (for 2008 data) we modified the report cards to assess the damage prevention metric for each facility type (actually, for Telecom, Natural Gas, Electric and Cable TV facility types as sufficient data was reported to build a model). This step now provides the lowest granular level of damage data collection, analysis, and reporting at the geographic and facility type level.

Although we had a metric that measured the level of public awareness, we still did not have a method of collecting and tracking damage prevention activities in each county. This information is needed to establish and monitor the relationship between the level and quality of public awareness and damage prevention programs in the county and the number of locate tickets and facilities damaged. This final piece of data allows us to measure the effectiveness of programs funded by stakeholders and the PHMSA grants. In 2009 we began creating a process to manually collect this information for each county.

Excerpt from the 2008 PHMSA Grant: "Although we are aware of many of the damage

prevention programs around the state, we have never attempted to centrally coordinate, document or catalogue these programs. Consequently, we are unable to assess the effectiveness of any particular program or the group of programs as a whole to impact damages in the state. We now realize the importance of this information and how it can be combined with the annual Damage Data Report and the DP Report Card to paint a clearer picture of the impact of damage prevention efforts. We hope PHMSA will see the value of this effort and will support this part of our project to develop a system to catalogue activities as a possible model for other states."

**Describe how the proposed project will enhance or continue implementation of this element: (Required only if proposal addresses this element)**

Improving Damage Prevention in Colorado:

Further improvements in Colorado's damage prevention program are needed. These improvements will come about by:

- a) inviting additional stakeholder participation
- b) sharing critical damage prevention information
- c) collaboratively reviewing and analyzing this information
- d) designing effective awareness, education and training programs
- e) collaboratively taking committed action to remediate the root causes of facility damages

There are four components of our damage prevention program that support Element 9.

1) Administer the PHMSA Grant.

This function is supported by the Forum Facilitator. As far as each task undertaken with the 2010 PHMSA Grant, formal timelines, goals and review processes will be discussed, implemented and tracked for each program initiative. We will continue to provide feedback and results to all stakeholders, including state and federal regulatory agencies.

2) Coordinate the design and integration of the Damage Prevention Activities tracking module and the Damage Prevention County Report Card module into the DP Portal.

This function is supported by the Forum Facilitator. The outcomes of the activities and programs implemented must continue to be reported, analyzed and shared with the stakeholders as a critical feedback mechanism to sustain the effectiveness of the overall damage prevention program in future years.

3) Develop the Damage Prevention Activities module in the DP Portal.

This function is performed by the software developers. We are currently documenting the data elements and design needed develop this module. We have also started to collect the activities data for 2008 and 2009.

4) Develop the Damage Prevention Report Card module in the DP Portal.

This function is performed by the software developers. The report card ties all the pieces together by providing a mechanism for measuring and monitoring four damage prevention

## **Legislative/Regulatory Actions**

**Provide a description of any legislature or regulatory actions (including legislative/regulatory studies) taken by the State within the past five (5) years pertaining to damage prevention program improvement, even if those actions were not completely successful.**

The Colorado One-Call Law was modified in August, 2009. This modification provided exclusion for "ROUTINE MAINTENANCE ON EXISTING PLANTED LANDSCAPES".

The Law goes on to define routine maintenance as:

"ROUTINE MAINTENANCE" MEANS A REGULAR ACTIVITY THAT HAPPENS AT LEAST ONCE PER YEAR ON AN EXISTING PLANTED LANDSCAPE IF EARTH IS NOT DISTURBED AT A DEPTH OF MORE THAN TWELVE INCHES BY NONMECHANICAL MEANS OR FOUR INCHES BY MECHANICAL MEANS AND IF THE ACTIVITIES ARE NOT INTENDED TO PERMANENTLY LESSEN THE GROUND COVER OR LOWER THE EXISTING GROUND CONTOURS. MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT USED FOR ROUTINE MAINTENANCE TASKS SHALL BE DEFINED AS AERATORS, HAND-HELD ROTOTILLERS, SOIL INJECTION NEEDLES, LAWN EDGERS, OVERSEEDERS, AND HAND TOOLS."

The Law also defines the notification requirement when a routine maintenance encounters an underground facility:

"IF A PERSON PERFORMING ROUTINE MAINTENANCE DISCOVERS AN UNDERGROUND FACILITY IN THE AREA WHERE THE ROUTINE MAINTENANCE IS BEING PERFORMED, THE PERSON SHALL NOTIFY THE NOTIFICATION ASSOCIATION AND THE AFFECTED OWNER OR OPERATOR AS QUICKLY AS PRACTICABLE AND REQUEST AN IMMEDIATE VERIFICATION OF THE LOCATION OF ANY UNDERGROUND FACILITY. UPON RECEIVING NOTIFICATION, THE AFFECTED OWNER OR OPERATOR SHALL RESPOND AS QUICKLY AS PRACTICABLE. THE PERSON SHALL CEASE ROUTINE MAINTENANCE ACTIVITIES IN THE IMMEDIATE AREA, AS DETERMINED BY EXERCISING DUE CAUTION AND CARE, UNTIL THE LOCATION OF ANY UNDERGROUND FACILITIES HAS BEEN VERIFIED."





**State Damage Prevention Application Attachments**

Governor\_Support\_Letter\_2009[1].pdf  
UNCC 2010 PHMSA Facilitator Labor Detail.pdf  
UNCC 2010 PHMSA Facilitator Travel Exp Detail.pdf  
UNCC 2010 PHMSA SW Dev Labor Detail.pdf  
UNCC 2010 PHMSA Expense Summary.pdf  
UNCC 2010 PHMSA 03-09 Damage Prev Metrics.pdf  
UNCC 2010 PHMSA 09 Share of Pop Tick Dam.pdf  
UNCC 2010 PHMSA 09 Damage Prev Activities.pdf



**Utility Notification Center of Colorado - 2010 PHMSA SDP Grant**  
**Damage Prevention Metrics - 2003-2009**

DEMOGRAPHICS		*based upon the sum of county values, not the reported state value						
Land Area:	104,093	Square Miles				%Change	%Change	%Change
	2008	2003	2006	2007	2008	2003-08	2006-07	2007-08
Population:		4,583,430	4,813,536	4,908,108	5,013,015	9.4%	2.0%	2.1%
Population Density (per sq.mi.):		44.0	46.2	47.2	48.2	9.5%	2.2%	2.1%
Net Migration:		24,315	54,784	54,686	49,843	105.0%	-0.2%	-8.9%
Building Permits:		39,569	38,343	29,454	18,998	-52.0%	-23.2%	-35.5%
	Counties							
ONE-CALL DATA	Reported							
Incoming Tickets:	64	788,314	727,039	643,630	563,041	-28.6%	-11.5%	-12.5%
Tickets / 1,000 Population	64	172	151	131	112	-34.7%	-13.2%	-14.4%
Tickets / Permit	64	20	19	22	30	48.8%	15.2%	35.6%
Facility Damages:	51	13,540	8,947	6,358	4,900	-63.8%	-28.9%	-22.9%
Telecom Damages	45	6,426	4,144	3,195	2,602	-59.5%	-22.9%	-18.6%
Nat Gas Damages	38	4,490	2,939	2,185	1,521	-66.1%	-25.7%	-30.4%
Electric Damages	24	1,666	1,497	635	472	-71.7%	-57.6%	-25.7%
Cable TV Damages	17	847	258	235	226	-73.3%	-8.9%	-3.8%
Other Damages	7	111	109	108	79	-28.8%	-0.9%	-26.9%
DAMAGE PREVENTION METRIC								
Damages / 1,000 Tickets:		17.2	12.3	9.9	8.7	-49.3%	-19.7%	-11.9%
Telecom Dam / 1,000 Tickets		8.2	5.7	5.0	4.6	-43.3%	-12.9%	-6.9%
Nat Gas Dam / 1,000 Tickets		5.7	4.0	3.4	2.7	-52.6%	-16.0%	-20.4%
Electric Dam / 1,000 Tickets		2.1	2.1	1.0	0.8	-60.3%	-52.1%	-15.0%
Cable TV Dam / 1,000 Tickets		1.1	0.4	0.4	0.4	-62.6%	2.9%	9.9%
Other Dam / 1,000 Tickets		0.1	0.1	0.2	0.1	-0.4%	11.9%	-16.4%

Utility Notification Center of Colorado - 2010 PHMSA SDP Grant  
2009 Share of Population, Tickets, and Damages for 11 Damage Prevention Councils

DPC	County Coverage	Ticket Share	Damage Share	Population
<b>Weld County</b>	Weld	8.3%	6.0%	5.0%
<b>Denver Metro Area</b>	Denver	7.3%	6.6%	12.1%
	Adams	6.3%	4.8%	8.7%
	Jefferson	7.4%	6.7%	10.8%
	Arapahoe	9.9%	10.3%	11.2%
	Douglas	7.0%	6.1%	5.7%
	Broomfield	1.5%	1.4%	1.1%
<b>El Paso County</b>	EL Paso	13.1%	13.2%	11.9%
<b>Las Animas County</b>	Las Animas	1.0%	0.9%	0.3%
<b>Mesa County</b>	Mesa	3.3%	6.6%	2.9%
<b>4 Corners Area</b>	La Plata	2.7%	1.6%	1.0%
	Montezuma	0.5%	1.4%	0.5%
	Ouray	0.2%	0.1%	0.1%
<b>Western Slope Area</b>	Delta	0.6%	0.4%	0.6%
- Rio Blanco	Montrose	0.9%	0.9%	0.8%
- Garfield				
- Moffat				
- Mesa				
<b>Larimer County</b>	Larimer	6.8%	5.1%	5.9%
<b>Fremont County</b>	Fremont	0.7%	0.8%	1.0%
<b>Mountain Area</b>	Pitkin	0.6%	1.7%	0.3%
	Eagle	1.0%	1.3%	1.1%
	Garfield	2.0%	2.7%	1.2%
<b>Northwest Area</b>	Rio Blanco	0.6%	0.2%	0.1%
	Moffat	0.2%	0.6%	0.3%
	Routt	0.7%	1.9%	0.5%
<b>Pueblo JUUC</b>	Pueblo	2.9%	5.2%	3.2%
<b>Aurora JUUC</b>				
- Denver				
- Adams				
- Arapahoe				
<b>TOTAL</b>	24	85.3%	86.5%	86.4%

**Utility Notification Center of Colorado - 2010 PHMSA SDP Grant**  
**2009 Damage Prevention Activities for 11 Damage Prevention Councils**

Year Formed								2009	2009	2009	2009
Damage Prevention Council	Weld County	Denver Metro Area	El Paso County	Las Animas County	Mesa County	Four Corners Area	Western Slope Area	Larimer County	Fremont County	PEG Area	2009 NW Corner Area
<b>COUNTIES SERVICED BY DPC</b>	Weld	Denver	EL Paso	Las Animas	Mesa	La Plata	Rio Blanco	Larimer	Fremont	Pitkin	Rio Blanco
		Adams				Montezuma	Garfield			Eagle	Moffat
		Jefferson				Ouray	Delta			Garfield	Routt
		Arapahoe					Montrose				
		Douglas					Moffat				
		Broomfield					Mesa				
<b>State Awareness Programs</b>											
State DP Proclamation	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
County Commissioner Report Card	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Mass Media Cable TV	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
UNCC Excavator Handbook	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
UNCC Stakeholder Education	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
UNCC 811 Promo Items Color Code, Decals, Banners	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
<b>Local DP Education Programs</b>											
Industry Education											
Group Contractor Event	1			1		12	20				
Group 1st Responder Event						12	20				
Individual Contractor Meetings			3								
<b>Local 811 Public Awareness Events</b>											
County DP Proclamation				1							
Municipal DP Proclamation				1							
811 Mass Media Cable TV					1		1				
811 Mass Media Radio				1	1		1				
811 Mass Media Newspaper				1	1						
811 Community Parade	1	1									
811 Community Event/HomeShow		1		1		1					
811 Town Banner	1		1								
811 Gas Station Placards		1									
811 Yard/Park Signs	1		1	1	1						
811 Hardware Store Signs			1	1	1						
811 Public Postcards			1		1						
811 Decals(Auto/ToolBox)		1		1	1						
811 Promo Items		1		1	1	1	1				
<b>Local Compliance Programs</b>											
Xcel Energy - Multiple Counties	X	X		X	X		X	X		X	X
Colo Springs Utility - 1 County			X								
Qwest Communications - Statewide	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Comcast Cable - Statewide	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Denver Metro DPC - In Discussion		?									
<b>Local DP Activities Count</b>											
Local DP Activities Count	4	5	7	10	8	26	43	0	0	0	0
DP Compliance Programs	3	4	3	3	3	2	3	3	2	3	3

SECTION C - NON-FEDERAL RESOURCES					
(a) Grant Program		(b) Applicant	(c) State	(d) Other Sources	(e) TOTALS
8.	State Damage Prevention Program	\$ <input type="text"/>	\$ <input type="text"/>	\$ <input type="text"/>	\$ <input type="text"/>
9.	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
10.	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
11.	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
12. TOTAL (sum of lines 8-11)		\$ <input type="text"/>	\$ <input type="text"/>	\$ <input type="text"/>	\$ <input type="text"/>

SECTION D - FORECASTED CASH NEEDS					
	Total for 1st Year	1st Quarter	2nd Quarter	3rd Quarter	4th Quarter
13. Federal	\$ <input type="text"/>	\$ <input type="text"/>	\$ <input type="text"/>	\$ <input type="text"/>	\$ <input type="text"/>
14. Non-Federal	\$ <input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
15. TOTAL (sum of lines 13 and 14)	\$ <input type="text"/>	\$ <input type="text"/>	\$ <input type="text"/>	\$ <input type="text"/>	\$ <input type="text"/>

SECTION E - BUDGET ESTIMATES OF FEDERAL FUNDS NEEDED FOR BALANCE OF THE PROJECT					
(a) Grant Program		FUTURE FUNDING PERIODS (YEARS)			
		(b) First	(c) Second	(d) Third	(e) Fourth
16.	State Damage Prevention Program	\$ <input type="text"/>	\$ <input type="text"/>	\$ <input type="text"/>	\$ <input type="text"/>
17.	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
18.	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
19.	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
20. TOTAL (sum of lines 16 - 19)		\$ <input type="text"/>	\$ <input type="text"/>	\$ <input type="text"/>	\$ <input type="text"/>

SECTION F - OTHER BUDGET INFORMATION	
21. Direct Charges: <input type="text"/>	22. Indirect Charges: <input type="text"/>
23. Remarks: <input type="text"/>	

## Application for Federal Assistance SF-424

Version 02

## \* 1. Type of Submission:

- ☐ Preapplication  
☒ Application  
☐ Changed/Corrected Application

## \* 2. Type of Application:

- ☒ New  
☐ Continuation  
☐ Revision

## \* If Revision, select appropriate letter(s):

## \* Other (Specify)

## \* 3. Date Received:

08/31/2009

## 4. Applicant Identifier:

## 5a. Federal Entity Identifier:

## \* 5b. Federal Award Identifier:

## State Use Only:

## 6. Date Received by State:

## 7. State Application Identifier:

## 8. APPLICANT INFORMATION:

## \* a. Legal Name:

Utility Notification Center of Colorado

## \* b. Employer/Taxpayer Identification Number (EIN/TIN):

84-1042045

## \* c. Organizational DUNS:

606252815

## d. Address:

## \* Street1:

16361 Table Mountain Parkway

## Street2:

## \* City:

Golden

## County:

## \* State:

CO: Colorado

## Province:

## \* Country:

USA: UNITED STATES

## \* Zip / Postal Code:

80403

## e. Organizational Unit:

## Department Name:

NA

## Division Name:

NA

## f. Name and contact information of person to be contacted on matters involving this application:

## Prefix:

Mr

## \* First Name:

James

## Middle Name:

## \* Last Name:

Maniscalco

## Suffix:

## Title:

Executive Director

## Organizational Affiliation:

## \* Telephone Number:

(303) 205 6301

## Fax Number:

## \* Email:

jdman@uncc.org

## Application for Federal Assistance SF-424

Version 02

## 9. Type of Applicant 1: Select Applicant Type:

A: State Government

Type of Applicant 2: Select Applicant Type:

Type of Applicant 3: Select Applicant Type:

\* Other (specify):

## \* 10. Name of Federal Agency:

Pipeline &amp; Hazardous Material Safety Administration

## 11. Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Number:

20.720

CFDA Title:

Pipeline Safety

## \* 12. Funding Opportunity Number:

DTPH56-10-SN-0001

\* Title:

State Damage Prevention Grants

## 13. Competition Identification Number:

Title:

## 14. Areas Affected by Project (Cities, Counties, States, etc.):

## \* 15. Descriptive Title of Applicant's Project:

Utility Notification Center of Colorado State Damage Prevention

Attach supporting documents as specified in agency instructions.

Add Attachments

Delete Attachments

View Attachments

**Application for Federal Assistance SF-424**

Version 02

**\* Applicant Federal Debt Delinquency Explanation**

The following field should contain an explanation if the Applicant organization is delinquent on any Federal Debt. Maximum number of characters that can be entered is 4,000. Try and avoid extra spaces and carriage returns to maximize the availability of space.



---

## CERTIFICATION REGARDING LOBBYING

### Certification for Contracts, Grants, Loans, and Cooperative Agreements

The undersigned certifies, to the best of his or her knowledge and belief, that:

(1) No Federal appropriated funds have been paid or will be paid, by or on behalf of the undersigned, to any person for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of an agency, a Member of Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a Member of Congress in connection with the awarding of any Federal contract, the making of any Federal grant, the making of any Federal loan, the entering into of any cooperative agreement, and the extension, continuation, renewal, amendment, or modification of any Federal contract, grant, loan, or cooperative agreement.

(2) If any funds other than Federal appropriated funds have been paid or will be paid to any person for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of any agency, a Member of Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a Member of Congress in connection with this Federal contract, grant, loan, or cooperative agreement, the undersigned shall complete and submit Standard Form-LLL, "Disclosure of Lobbying Activities," in accordance with its instructions.

(3) The undersigned shall require that the language of this certification be included in the award documents for all subawards at all tiers (including subcontracts, subgrants, and contracts under grants, loans, and cooperative agreements) and that all subrecipients shall certify and disclose accordingly. This certification is a material representation of fact upon which reliance was placed when this transaction was made or entered into. Submission of this certification is a prerequisite for making or entering into this transaction imposed by section 1352, title 31, U.S. Code. Any person who fails to file the required certification shall be subject to a civil penalty of not less than \$10,000 and not more than \$100,000 for each such failure.

### Statement for Loan Guarantees and Loan Insurance

The undersigned states, to the best of his or her knowledge and belief, that:

If any funds have been paid or will be paid to any person for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of any agency, a Member of Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a Member of Congress in connection with this commitment providing for the United States to insure or guarantee a loan, the undersigned shall complete and submit Standard Form-LLL, "Disclosure of Lobbying Activities," in accordance with its instructions. Submission of this statement is a prerequisite for making or entering into this transaction imposed by section 1352, title 31, U.S. Code. Any person who fails to file the required statement shall be subject to a civil penalty of not less than \$10,000 and not more than \$100,000 for each such failure.

#### \* APPLICANT'S ORGANIZATION

Utility Notification Center of Colorado

#### \* PRINTED NAME AND TITLE OF AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE

Prefix: Mr \* First Name: James Middle Name:

\* Last Name: Maniscalco Suffix:

\* Title: Executive Director

\* SIGNATURE: JD Maniscalco

\* DATE: 08/31/2009

# STATE OF COLORADO

## OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR

136 State Capitol Building  
Denver, Colorado 80203  
(303) 866 - 2471  
(303) 866 - 2003 fax



Bill Ritter, Jr.  
Governor

August 26, 2009

Warren D. Osterberg  
Agreement Officer  
DOT / Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration  
1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE, E22-103  
Washington, D.C. 20590

Mr. Osterberg,

Colorado recognizes that reducing underground excavation damage requires an effective collaborative process to minimize underground facility damage. Colorado supports the efforts of the Pipeline and Hazardous Material Safety Administration's (PHMSA) excavation damage prevention Grant initiatives and their support to States.

Colorado established the One-Call Notification System in 1986 to ensure that underground facilities are properly marked before any digging or excavation project begins. The Utility Notification Center of Colorado (UNCC) is recognized as the statewide notification authority between excavators and facility owners when excavation activity is needed. I am designating the UNCC as the Colorado State authority eligible for the State Damage Prevention Program grant.

Colorado will continue to be a State where damage prevention will continue to play a large role in the protection our underground infrastructure, preventing injuries, and keep the citizens of this state safe.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Bill Ritter Jr." in a cursive style.

Bill Ritter Jr.  
Governor